

Exploring Medical Innovation

New for 2021-2022

The list of suggested websites to review has been updated.
Editorial updates have been made for clarity.

Event Summary

Exploring Medical Innovation provides **Middle School Division** HOSA members with the opportunity to gain knowledge regarding a medical innovation that impacted the future of health or the delivery of healthcare. This competitive event consists of a display and presentation and each team consists of 2-4 people. This event aims to inspire members to be proactive future health professionals and understand and research the value of medical innovation.

Dress Code

Competitors must be in official HOSA uniform or in proper business attire. Bonus points will be awarded for [proper dress](#). All team members must be properly dressed to receive bonus points.

General Rules

1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA in good standing in the Middle School division ONLY (in grades 6-8 during the 2020-2021 school year).
2. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the [“General Rules and Regulations of the HOSA Competitive Events Program \(GRR\).”](#)
3. The medical innovation must be presented by a team of 2-4 HOSA members.
4. All competitors shall report to the site of the event at the time designated for each round of competition. At ILC, competitor’s [photo ID](#) must be presented prior to ALL competition rounds.

Official References

5. A websites that may provide useful information is:
 - [Johnson and Johnson Innovation Lab](#)
 - [Cleveland Clinic](#)
 - [Deloitte](#)

The Medical Innovation Research and Display Content

6. The team will select a medical innovation that demonstrates something unique, and/or important in medicine or the delivery of healthcare. The team will research and explore everything they can about the innovation, and then present their findings to a panel of judges.
7. Topics could include, but are not limited to:
 1. Medical or healthcare innovation
 2. Emerging technologies in health
 3. Advances in medicine
8. **Display and Presentation Contents:** Teams will be judged on how effectively the display and presentation informs the judges about the medical innovation.

Information should include, but is not limited to, the below items. Teams can decide what information is best represented in the display and what information is best shared verbally with the judges, or both. Anyone viewing the display materials should be able to have a general idea of the medical innovation without having someone there to speak about it.

- a. What the innovation is and what it does/how it is used?
 - b. How did/will the medical innovation change healthcare?
 - c. Why did the team choose the medical innovation?
 - d. Provide a history of the innovation, including information about its creator(s) and how it was discovered.
 - e. What benefits/challenges are associated with this innovation?
 - f. Cost of the innovation for the consumer and/or the healthcare system
 - g. Career implications – where does this innovation fit in the healthcare field? What practitioners or consumers are using it?
9. The work **must** be the work of the competitors, including the artistic aspects of the display. Allowable artwork may include:
- a. Competitor produced illustrations, designs, and/or computer-generated graphics.
 - b. Clip art or other graphics used in compliance with copyright laws.
 - c. Photographs used in compliance with copyright laws.
 - d. Computer or machine generated lettering.
10. Reference Page: List the literature cited to give guidance to the display. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. One page only. The reference page must be uploaded to the link provided in these guidelines by ONE team member. Reference page must also include: Event Name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Association, Chosen Innovation. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page, but the formatting of the reference page is not judged.*
11. There will be one or two teams per table. Once assembled on the table the maximum display dimensions allowed are:
- WIDTH: 48 inches DEPTH: 24 inches
- The display will be measured by the Section Leader or Event Manager before judging begins, from a beginning point to the furthest point of the display.
- A. There is no maximum height limit, however display must be stable enough to sit on the table without assistance or fear of falling.
 - B. Width will be measured from the widest point of anything on the display to the opposite point.
 - C. Depth will be measured from the deepest point of anything on the display to the furthest opposite point.
 - D. Display materials may not extend beyond the edge of the display table.
 - E. Dimensions include models, electronics, mannequins and all other display items.
 - F. Display must be submitted in English for judging.
12. Electricity will not be provided. Teams **MUST** use battery power instead of electricity for their displays if power is required. Any noise (bells, alarms, etc....) used in display/presentation must not interfere with neighboring display/presentations.

13. No equipment/supplies (except tables) will be provided by HOSA-Future Health Professionals for this event. All equipment/supplies needed must be provided by the team. No Wi-Fi or internet service will be provided.
14. Competitors are responsible for the safety and proper functioning of all equipment they bring to this event. Teams *may not* use any flames, body fluids, living organisms, sharps, or any equipment/materials that could expose anyone to risk of bodily harm or danger. Invasive procedures and skin puncturing of any kind are **prohibited**.

The Competitive Process / Presentation

15. At ILC, all competitors shall report to the site of the event at the designated set-up time. When instructed, the team will have **fifteen (15) minutes** to assemble their display. The innovation and any associated materials needed to explain the innovation will be created prior to competition. The time for assembly is to set up what the team has previously created in preparation for judging.
16. Use of Display During Presentation: All teams will have the same size table. Display must fit on this table without hanging off, as the next table may be in very close proximity. Teams may take things off the table/display to show the judges and utilize the space around the display, as long as they do not encroach on an equal distance from the next display.
17. Teams should assemble materials so that the overall display can stand-alone. This may include any pre-recorded materials on battery powered devices.
18. The team will report to their display at their assigned appointment time to present a five (5) minute prepared oral presentation to the judges.
 - A. Use of index card notes during the presentation are permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smart phone, laptop, etc....) are permitted, but will not be shown to judges.
 - B. All team members must take an active role in the presentation.
19. At the conclusion of the five (5) minute prepared oral presentation, judges will have two (2) minutes to ask questions of the competitors. The timekeeper will notify teams when one minute (1) remains and notify the judges when these two (2) minutes have ended. Judges will then have two (2) additional minutes to complete the rating sheets.

Final Scoring

20. In the event of a tie, a tiebreaker will be determined by the areas on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value in descending order.
21. Display must be picked up by competitors as instructed. Any displays not picked up ***within the given timeframe*** will be discarded.

Required Digital Uploads

22. The following items must be uploaded as a single document, pdf preferred, by ONE member of the team to [THIS LINK](#)
 - a. Reference Page and 1-3 photos of display.
 - b. Uploads for ILC will be open from April 15th - May 15th for ILC qualified competitors only.

NOTE: Chartered Associations have the option to use hard copy submissions instead of digital submissions. Please check with your State Advisor to determine

what process is used in your chartered association. For ILC, only digital submissions will be used for judging if uploaded by May 15th.

Competitor Must Provide

- [Photo ID](#)
- Upload of reference page and 1-3 photos of display to link provided by deadline
- All display materials/display items, including the Reference page
- #2 Pencil for evaluation
- All audio visual equipment needed (optional)
- Index cards or electronic notecards for presentation (optional)
- Watch with second hand (optional)

EXPLORING MEDICAL INNOVATION Judge's Rating Sheet

Section # _____
Team # _____

Judge's Signature _____
Division: MIDDLE SCHOOL ONLY

One PDF file containing Reference Page and 1-3 photos of the Display Uploaded Online*:
Yes ____ No ____
*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.

A. Exploring Medical Innovation						
A. Overview	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Display Requirement	Visual display is no more than 48" wide x 24" deep, safely stands on the table, and poses no hazard.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Visual display does not meet stated requirements.	
B. DISPLAY & PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Balance of Information between Display and Presentation	The content placed between the display and presentation was balanced and effective. Anyone viewing the display materials would be able to have a general idea of the medical innovation without having someone there to speak about it. The content shared in the presentation added value to the overall project. Overall, there was excellent balance between information shared in the display and information shared in the presentation.	Overall, the balance was good and effective between information shared in the display and information shared in the presentation.	Overall, the balance seemed okay between information shared in the display and information shared in the presentation, but judges were left with a few questions unanswered in either the display or presentation.	There was a somewhat imbalance of information shared. Either the display or the presentation had more content than the other, which made it difficult to follow the overall project.	There was a clear imbalance of information shared. Either the display or the presentation had the majority of the content, which made for an ineffective overall project.	
B. DISPLAY & PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
2. Description of Innovation	The team provides an excellent description of the innovation, what it does and how it is used. The judges can clearly visualize what it is.	The team provides a good description of what the innovation is, what it does, and how it is used. The judge has a few unanswered questions.	The team provides an average description of what the innovation is, what it does, and how it is used, but the judge is left with many unanswered questions.	The description of the innovation does not describe what it is, does or how it is used.	No description of the innovation was provided.	

B. DISPLAY & PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Impact on Healthcare	The team provides a detailed and relevant description for how the medical innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	The team provides good detail for how the medical innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	An average description for how the future of healthcare will be/has been impacted by this innovation.	Little detail was provided on how the innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	No description was provided on how the innovation will change/impact healthcare.	
4. Why this Innovation?	Compelling examples of why the team chose this medical innovation were given. Relevant and engaging stories were shared that brought the presentation to life and made it clear to the judges why this was the innovation chosen by the team.	The team provided engaging examples of why they chose the medical innovation. Stories were shared to add a personal touch why the medical innovation was selected, but the wow-factor was missing.	The team told the story for why they chose their medical innovation but were unable to provide relevant examples to bring the story to life.	The team attempted to tell a story of the significance of choosing their medical innovation, but the relevance of the story fell short of expectation.	The team was unable to connect the story for why they chose their medical innovation.	
5. History of the Innovation	Extensive history of the creation of the innovation was provided and included rich details about its creator(s) and how it was discovered.	A history on the creation of the innovation was provided, along with a description of who created it and how it was discovered.	A brief history was provided on the creation of the innovation. Some details about the creator(s) and background of discovery was provided.	Little history was provided about the history of the innovation, who created it or how it was discovered.	No history or details of how this innovation was founded were provided.	
6. Benefits & Challenges	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were highlighted in extensive detail by the team.	Benefits and challenges were shared by the team.	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were shared but did not go into great depth.	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were briefly mentioned.	No mention of the benefits or challenges of the innovation were included.	
7. Cost	Detailed information about the cost of the innovation for the consumer and/or the healthcare system was shared.	N/A	Information was shared about the cost of the innovation but judges were left with unanswered questions.	N/A	No relevant information was shared about the cost of the innovation.	
8. Career Implications	Detailed information was shared about how the innovation fits within the healthcare field and what practitioners / consumers are needed to implement it. It is clear how and what healthcare careers are affected by this innovation.	Mostly relevant information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	Some information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	A fair amount of information was shared about the career implications of this innovation, but more detail is needed to be relevant.	No information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	

C. Display	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Artistic Design	The artistic quality is exceptional. The artwork is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the display to the next level.	The artistic quality is good; the artwork stands out. The design elements seem to be well-thought out and comprehensive.	The display incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the design lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the display.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the display. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the artwork on the display is pleasing to the eye,	Display photos not submitted OR The design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
2. Creativity / Originality	The display incorporates creativity and innovation that make it unique. The display has the "wow-factor" and stands out in the room above all others.	The display is innovative and creative. It offers something unique but is missing the wow-factor.	The display has moderate levels of creativity and originality.	Basic elements of creativity and innovation were captured in this health career display. It blends in with the other competitors.	Display photos not submitted OR Little creativity or originality was captured in the display. More effort needed.	
3. Appearance / Organization	The display is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow.	Display is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors.	The display was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood. .	The display lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order.	Display photos not submitted OR The display is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
C. Display	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. Reference Page	Reference page is included and contains Event name, Competitor/Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Assoc, & Chosen Innovation	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page is not included OR reference page does not include all requirements.	
D. PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Display Incorporated into Presentation	The display enhanced the messaging of the innovation and helped bring the presentation to life.	The display helped tell the story of the innovation. It complemented the presentation effectively.	The team did an adequate job of using the display to support the presentation.	The display somewhat enhanced the presentation on the innovation yet seemed to miss key points of emphasis.	The display seemed to be an "afterthought" to the presentation. There was a disconnect between what was featured on the display and the presentation.	
2. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to little variety in rate or volume.	The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused during the majority of presentation.	

D. PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
D. PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. Team Participation	Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the project. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the project presentation.	All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the project presentation.	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others.	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the project presentation.	
6. Answered judge questions effectively.	The team provided excellent answers to judge's questions, shared important details and maintained a high level of professionalism and poise throughout the presentation.	The team answered the judge's questions accurately and provided some important details about the medical innovation.	The team was able to answer most of the questions effectively, could have provided more details regarding the innovation process.	The team answered some of the questions but failed to expound on the details of the medical innovation.	The team had trouble answering the judge's questions. More evidence is needed to demonstrate a basic understanding of the medical innovation.	
Total Points (130):						

*Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness.

**Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially